The RECONSTRUCTIONIST

VOL. XIV. MAY 28, 1948 IYAR 19, 5708 No 8

ביום ההוא אקים את סכת דוד הנפלת...
ושבתי את שבות עמי ישראל... ונטעתים
על אדמתם ולא ינתשו עוד מעל אדמתם
אשר נתתי להם אמר ה' אלהיך:

On that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that has fallen . . . and I will bring back the captives of my people Israel . . . and I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be plucked up out of their land which I have given them, says the Lord your God.

Amos 9: 11, 14-15

Dedicated to the advancement of Judaism as a religious civilization, to the upbuilding of Israel's ancient homeland, and to the furtherance of universal freedom, justice and peace.

the Reconstructionist

is published bi-weekly for twenty consecutive issues, starting in October, by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, Inc., 15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y. Subscription $3.00 per year; 15¢ per copy; foreign 25¢ extra; membership in the Foundationn, $5.00 per year, including subscription to *The Reconstructionist.* Reentered as second class matter October 3, 1935, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITORIAL BOARD:
Chairman: **Mordecai M. Kaplan**
Associate Chairman: **Ira Eisenstein**
Managing Editor: **Eugene Kohn**

Associate Editors: **Israel S. Chipkin, Judith K. Eisenstein, Theodore Friedman, Roland B. Gittelsohn, Jacob S. Golub, Emanuel Green, Bernard Heller, Will Herberg, Aharon Kessler, Immanuel Lewy, Edward T. Sandrow, Leo Shapiro, Milton Steinberg, Bernard Weinryb, Max Wiener.**

Contributing Editors: **Morris Adler, Michael Alper, Nathan A. Barack, Morton M. Berman, Philip S. Bernstein, Asher Block, Samuel M. Blumenfied, Ben-Zion Bokser, William J. Boxerman, Jack J. Cohen, Mortimer J. Cohen, Lawrence W. Crohn, Samuel Dinin, Harry Essrig, Emanuel Gamoran, Judah I. Goldin, Solomon Goldman, Robert Gordis, Samuel G. Kohs, Milton Konvitz, Myer S. Kripke, Louis M. Levitsky, Theodore N. Lewis, Joshua Loth Liebman, Sidney Morgenbesser, Maurice Pekarsky, David Polish, Joshua Trachtenberg, Leo Trepp. Max Weine, Jacob J. Weinstein.**

Executive Secretary: **Hannah L. Goldberg**

AMONG OUR CONTRIBUTORS

SAMUEL M. BLUMENFIELD is president of the College of Jewish Studies, Chicago, and a contributing editor to THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST.

LIBBY M. KLAPPERMAN has written dramatic pieces which have been presented by several Jewish organizations.

NOAH NARDI is psychologist and educational consultant for the Jewish Education Committee of New York. He is the author of *Education in Palestine* and *Zionism and Education in Palestine.* His articles and surveys on Jewish education have been widely published.

STANLEY RABINOWITZ is rabbi of Congregation B'nai Jacob, New Haven, Conn.

HELEN JOY WEINBERG has previously contributed poetry to THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST.

THE JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION

is proud to announce the summer publication of a

HOLY DAY PRAYER BOOK

for

ROSH HASHANAH and YOM KIPPUR

Edited by Mordecai M. Kaplan, Eugene Kohn and Ira Eisenstein
in two volumes.

The Holy Day Prayer Book Revised to Express the Best in the Religious Thinking and Feeling of Modern Jews.

Hebrew Text with New English Translation
Special Readings from Ancient, Medieval and Modern Sources
Torah and Haftarah Readings with Interpretative Introductions.

Price to be announced.

JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION, Inc.,
15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y.

Please reserve for me ..... copies of the Holy Day Prayer Book.

Name .....

Address .....

The RECONSTRUCTIONIST

Vol. XIV. May 28, 1948 Iyar 19, 5708 No. 8

EDITORIALS

THE MIRACLE HAS HAPPENED

"WE hereby proclaim the establishment of the Jewish state in Palestine, to be called Israel. . . .

"The state of Israel will promote the development of the country for the benefit of all its inhabitants; will be based on precepts of liberty, justice and peace taught by the Hebrew prophets; will uphold the full social and political equality of all its citizens without distinction of race, creed or sex; will guarantee full freedom of conscience, worship, education and culture; will safeguard the sanctity and inviolability of shrines and holy places of all religions; and will dedicate itself to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. . . .

"We call upon the Arab inhabitants of the state of Israel to return to the ways of peace and play their part in the development of the state, with full and equal citizenship and due representation in all its bodies and institutions, provisional or permanent.

"We offer peace and amity to all neighboring states and their peoples. . . . The state of Israel is ready to contribute its full share to the peaceful progress and reconstitution of the Middle East. *Our call goes out to the Jewish people all over the world to rally to our side in the task of immigration and development and to stand by us in the great struggle for the fulfilment of the dream of generations—the redemption of Israel.*"

"The redemption of Israel"—no phrase could more happily express the historic significance of the moment of the birth of the new Jewish state. In the spiritual exaltation with which Jews everywhere greeted the news of the declaration of Israel's independence and of its recognition by the United States, one sensed an awareness of the transcendent importance of the historic occasion. Something more than a mere change in political situation had taken place. Our generation has had the *zekhut* to witness and bear testimony to a triumphant act of faith, to the successful assertion of the spiritual forces making for freedom, justice and peace in the face of apparently insuperable obstacles.

Who would have believed possible fifty years ago what has happened today? On what scientific sociological laws could one have then foreseen that the Jews would, in the year 1948, reconstitute their national state in the homeland from which they had been exiled almost 19 centuries ago? True, a few visionaries like Herzl

and his colleagues might have dreamt such a dream, but any sensible person, any rational intelligence that did not indulge in wishful thinking, could have given a thousand reasons to prove that the dream would never be realized. That a people deprived of its land for almost two millenia, a people scattered, maligned and reviled by multitudes among whom they lived, a people whose significant history the world thought had ended with the establishment of Christianity, leaving it a mere ghost of a nation, a people that had largely come to doubt its own right to a collective existence—that such a people could resettle its desolate land, restore fertility to its soil, establish rural and urban communities, revive its ancient language and civilization, and finally achieve independent statehood in the midst of peoples bent on thwarting that consummation — such an achievement partakes of the miraculous. It is an evidence that men can draw on a Divine Power to make dreams come true if those dreams conform to the law of righteousness that expresses His transcendent purpose in the evolution of human society. That is why Jews gave expression to their gratitude in the words of the ancient *berakhah,* thanking God *shehehiyanu, vekiyemanu, vehiggiyanu lazman hazeh,* for having "kept us in life and sustained us and enabled us to reach this moment."

If comments in the press and on the radio are any indications, the non-Jewish world also seems to have sensed that something extraordinary was being enacted before their eyes, something of far greater import than the mere struggle of a small country for liberation from foreign domination. If such miracles of redemption can take place, if such dry bones can live again, who knows what further wonders God can work? The moral forces that have been all but stifled by the suffocating atmosphere of cynicism and materialism created by the power politicians can now rally and breathe a little more freely.

Perhaps history in one of its great cycles is about to repeat itself. As in the first century B.C.E., so again today, Palestine is the center of the world's attention. Now as then a civilization saddened and disillusioned with the results of war and economic and military imperialism has its gaze fixed in wonder and a degree of expectancy on Zion. And for much the same reason, for again there has been demonstrated in the land and by the descendants of the same people a supreme faith in the possibility of redemption. Who knows? Perhaps the world will take new courage and faith from the miracle of Israel's resurrection as a nation in our day. Perhaps the United Nations will see in it a token of redemption for humanity, a *besarah tovah,* an evangel (the Greek translation of that Hebrew phrase meaning "glad tidings"), and perhaps, it will now address itself with new faith and confidence to the holy task to which it is dedicated, of establishing peace, justice and cooperation among the peoples of the world.

Let us then rejoice, but, in the spirit of the psalmist's admonition, "Let us rejoice with trembling." We have won a great victory, but not the final victory. We have won the recognition of the right of our people to a collective existence and a free and independent national home. But the Arab world, backed by evil predatory interests elsewhere is still bent on destroying all that we have built. Much remains for us to do. We know now that the apparently impossible can come to pass because nothing is "too wonderful for God." But we must expose ourselves to His redeeming power by willing our own redemption from the *galut* psychology. We must respond to the final appeal of the Declaration of Independence of Israel by rallying to the support of the

Yishuv in its struggle for the "redemption of Israel."

Henceforth the Yishuv is politically on its own. We American Jews have no part in its political decisions and are not committed in advance to its political policies. But we and the Yishuv are still parts of the same people, bound together by indissoluble cultural and spiritual ties which we must do all in our power to strengthen. There must be an end to the nonsense that only a common creed or a common cult binds Jews together and that we have no more interest in the state of Israel than in any other "foreign" state. We have the immediate task of seeing that our country gives substance to its recognition of the Jewish state by making possible the defense of that state against the powers that menace it, and by taking the lead in getting the United Nations to apply sanctions against the aggressor Arab states. We must oversubscribe the United Jewish Appeal. We must back Haganah in every way possible. We must make educational use of the valor, heroism and devotion to ideals of social justice displayed by the Yishuv, in order to produce a generation of American Jews of equal spiritual stature. All this American Jewry must do in order to merit the thrill of joy that we have already experienced in the birth of the new Jewish state and to share in the redemption of Israel which the Jewish state is designed to effect.

A CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN STATESMANSHIP

THE diplomatic byplay that is fast enveloping Ambassador Smith's communication to Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov and the latter's reply should not be permitted to obscure the possible significance of the incident. Here may be the new factor to break the hardening stalemate into which the "cold war" seems to be developing.

Speculation as to the motives behind Ambassador Smith's original step would seem to be rather futile and unrewarding. Even the original intention is now to some extent irrelevant. Molotov's quick response to, and public exploitation of, the American communication have created a new situation and it is in this situation that American policy must operate. The Soviet move may be explained in terms of the Marshall Plan, the consolidation of a Western Bloc on the Continent and the Italian elections; the fact remains that the Soviet Foreign Minister has procalimed the readiness of his government to enter into "a discussion and settlement of differences existing between us" in line with Ambassador Smith's insistence that "the door is always wide open for full discussion and the composing of our differences." Subsequent disavowals and qualifications cannot change the accomplished fact.

It is not necessary to fall victim to illusion to see the significance of this development. The "differences" between the Soviet Union and the Western democracies are not merely "misunderstandings" which a little frank discussion can clear up. They are, in large part at least, rooted in important conflicts of interest and certainly reflect a profound and far-reaching divergence of outlook. Foreign Minister Molotov's statement, moreover, offers but little hope for any serious change in Soviet attitude: Russian aggression is still justified according to the now-familiar formula. The very effort to convert Ambassador Smith's letter into a plea for "peace" which Russia is ready to "accept" is not particulary reassuring. Yet the fact remains that the suggestion for direct United States-Russian discussions has been made—no matter how or by whom—and

that this suggestion has aroused new hope throughout the world.

Here is a great opportunity for creative American statesmanship. Even those of us who very largely go along with the general objectives of American foreign policy—to the degree that we can make them out—must deplore the lack of broad and comprehensive vision, the self-defeating narrowness of approach, the too frequent tendency to think in exclusively military terms, that characterize both the White House and the State Department in international affairs. Military security is, of course, an important aspect of foreign policy, but it is by no means all of it or even a beginning. President Truman's lack of any decisive policy of his own has too frequently made it possible for the "line" of the Department of Defense to become the foreign policy of the nation.

The one great exception is the Marshall Plan. The Marshall Plan is an example of the creative statesmanship we have in mind. The economic rehabilitation of the Continent on the basis of an integrated plan, the consolidation and unification of the Western democracies, constitute a vital contribution to human welfare and represent broad-visioned, imaginative world statesmanship at its best. But the Marshall Plan is not enough.

The United States must take more direct initiative in the struggle for peace. Fully facing the realities of the post-war situation, it is necessary to take bold, decisive action to break the deadlock of the "cold war." Let us get around the table with Russia and do our best to explore the areas of conflict and to define the issues that divide the world. Let us do this within the framework of the U.N., by all means, if possible, and certainly with the constant participation of the other nations whose interests are involved. Let us determine what the issues are that jeopardize the peace of the world. Some of these issues may be eliminated, others alleviated, still others circumscribed, and even those that remain in all their urgency clarified as to their significance and implications. Let us at least see where we stand and what we can do to save the world from another plunge into disaster.

There is no suggestion here of "appeasement" or of a new Munich at others' expense. Surely we have had too much experience to take that road. But every discussion is not "appeasement," nor is every negotiation a preparation for a new Munich. The very feeling that all discussion is futile and that all negotiation is betrayal is a revealing symptom of the desperate defeatism into which the world has maneuvered itself.

We now have the opportunity of breaking through this vicious circle and saying a new word. It is not yet too late, despite Secretary Marshall's discouraging attitude. A despairing world looks to us in hope for leadership. American statesmanship must not fail at a moment so critical.

A JUDICIAL DECISION THAT NEEDS PUBLIC BACKING

THE Supreme Court has recently handed down a very important decision on racial and religious segregation. It has ruled that the courts may not enforce covenants to restrict, on racial or religious grounds, the sale or rental of real estate. The vote was 6-0 and was therefore virtually unanimous, since three of the judges had disqualified themselves on the ground that they lived in restricted neighborhoods.

Segregation is one of the worst blots on our democracy. It creates slums and is a threat to our national unity, for it invites fifth column activities. It is the very negation of democracy. It creates a dangerous dichotomy in our national personality and makes our position quite vulnerable in

international negotiations involving human rights.

But the Supreme Court's ruling does not automatically abolish the evil. It does not even prohibit people from entering into restrictive covenants; it only makes it impossible to enforce such covenants by law. It probably goes as far as it could go without impairing the freedom of contract which is guaranteed by the Constitution.

It is well to bear in mind, however, that even the best legislation backed by wise judicial decision can be effective only to the extent that it is also backed by public opinion. The State of New York, for example passed a Fair Employment Practices Act (the Ives-Quinn Law) and the State Commission Against Discrimination was charged with its enforcement. Nevertheless that agency has had a very limited success in effecting the purpose of the law. Public utilities, banks, and insurance companies, to give just a few examples, have found means of evading it. An aroused public conscience is needed to make such laws and judicial decisions a vital part of our daily living. Given such an aroused conscience, the Supreme Court decision can be utilized to good effect in discouraging and eventually abolishing the evil of racially or religiously restrictive covenants.

Our problem then is how to arouse the public conscience. If all those adversely affected by the present practice were apprised of their rights under the law, and all who oppose the practice on moral grounds were aware of the means at their disposal for thwarting the segregationists, they could use the decision of the Supreme Court to deal a death blow to restrictive convenants.

But who shall undertake this task of public education. We have no government department that has the responsibility of educating the public about the significance of legislation or judicial action. Nor would we want government to assume that responsibility. There is too great danger that such a course might lead to totalitarian "thought control."

In theory the education of the public concerning the way laws and court decisions affect it is a function of the press and the radio. But it is well-known that, in practice, news stories are "planted and slanted" and often omitted altogether. Some government agencies do maintain public relations departments to assure themselves a good press. But, obviously, the Supreme Court, whose decisions are of paramount importance, cannot maintain such a department; so we find again and again that important decisions of that body receive only a few paragraphs on the front pages of our newspapers while the body of the story is relegated to the inside pages where it is buried among the advertisements.

The fight against segregation seems, therefore, to devolve primarily upon voluntary civic and communal agencies that take democracy seriously. The schools, the churches, synagogues, community centers and similar social agencies must do their utmost to keep the public informed of the significance of laws and legal decisions from the democratic viewpoint. Inasmuch as the task is a colossal one requiring ample funds, it would be well if some philanthropic foundation interested in the public welfare might make the dissemination of the relevant knowledge and the appeal to the appropriate action to end religious and racial discrimination its special work.

At any rate we must not cherish the illusion that laws and courts can bring on the millenium. Bettering human relations among the various religious and racial groups of this country is everybody's job and everybody must take a hand in

it, beginning with the betterment of his own personal relations to those of different race or religion.

REALITIES AND VALUES

WE WONDER HOW MANY American Jews who are thrilled by the news of the deeds of valor and heroism done by the Israelis (we must accustom ourselves to the term by which citizens of the state of Israel are to be known), think of what the maintenance of the state costs under existing conditions of total warfare, and under the necessity of simultaneously accommodating the mass migration of DP's which has already begun.

To be sure, the Yishuv expects, and has the right to expect, financial assistance from American Jewry, for it is fighting our battle as well as its own. But it is more than holding up its end of the job of financing the war, beside assuming complete responsibility for fighting it.

It has just issued its first State bonds for an internal loan of $20,000,000. The loan will be repaid each half year, within five years, at 3 percent interest. This is in addition to money received from its citizens in the form of donations and taxes. All elements of the population participate in the loan. Labor's share will be raised by each worker's subscribing two weeks' wages as a minimum.

Early subscriptions show that the loan is being taken up with enthusiasm. With equal enthusiasm on the part of American Jewry, and with the resources at its command, the UJA quota of $250,000,000, our pledged contribution to the struggle for Israel's survival and redemption, will certainly be oversubscribed.

▼

WE CALLED ATTENTION IN OUR last issue to the spiritual importance and the financial needs of the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus. We are accordingly gratified to learn that the National Council of Jewish Women has decided to contribute $36,000 for the use of the University's Education Department.

The contribution actually makes $72,000 available for that purpose, because the Palestine Government last year announced its willingness to contribute $36,000 if a similar sum could be obtained also from other sources.

Last year the University incurred a deficit of $100,000. Perhaps some other organizations or individuals may be moved to follow the Council's worthy example and help put the University on its feet.

▼

AMERICAN OFFICIALS OF THE U. S. zone of Germany have refused to extradite to Poland men accused of war crimes in that country. The reason given is that the main witnesses against them were Jewish displaced persons who "cannot be considered objective and impartial."

The World Jewish Congress has justly protested this action.

Since no human being who witnessed the atrocities committed by the Nazis could possibly be without prejudice against genocide unless he were himself a Nazi, the contention of the authorities of the American zone is tantamount to a demand that only men of Nazi mentality may bear testimony in these trials. That is not objectivity; it is hypocrisy.

▼

DR. MARTIN NIEMOELLER HAS some trenchant criticism to offer of our efforts to denazify Germany, and his criticism seems to us to make sense.

"Those who are being denazified," he is reported by *Religious News Service* as saying, "busy themselves collecting documents and witnesses to prove their innocence. Those who do the denazifying re-

gard themselves as white lambs, because they are the judges. This leads both groups to a self-righteous attitude and prevents them from a critical examination of their conscience and from admitting their guilt."

His idea is that denazification should have been left to the churches rather than to the military government.

Whether the churches would have had any more success is open to question, but we believe that Niemoeller is correct in saying, as he does, that it would have been better if the denazification laws had been enforced by the French, British, Russians or Americans rather than by the Germans, for then the Germans would have looked upon the process as part of God's punishment carried out by His chosen instruments.

One thing is clear, that the problem of denazification has either been bungled or cannot be solved by any method that is at present available.

▼

THE SUGGESTION COMES FROM nine Hiroshima pastors that August 6 be set aside as World Peace Day, that being the anniversary of the destruction wrought in Hiroshima by the first atom bomb.

The suggestion was made to the annual meeting of the North American Administrative Committee of the World Council of Christian Education.

The idea appeals to us. There ought to be a holiday, or rather a holy day, observed simultaneously all over the world and focusing attention not on national patriotism but on devotion to the idea of the essential unity of mankind and the common interest of all peoples in establishing peaceful relations among them.

The date chosen also appeals to us. It would tend to make of World Peace Day a day not of smug complacency with our humane sentiments, but of that "fear of the Lord" which is "the beginning of wisdom." It would make us aware of the catastrophe we invite when we deviate from peaceful ways, and of the need not merely of refraining from war but of seeking peace and pursuing it.

▼

HARPER AND BROTHERS AN-nounces the publication of *The Book of Books* by Dr. Solomon Goldman of the Anshe Emet Synagogue of Chicago.

This volume is an introduction to a thirteen volume commentary to the Bible. The series is designed to give a chapter by chapter summary of the content of the Biblical books and extended excerpts in a new translation, together with annotations and a study of each book's background.

The launching of so ambitious a project by as scholarly and distinguished a writer as Dr. Goldman is a cultural event of major importance. It is a mark of the gradual spiritual maturing of American Jewry that such a series of books can be projected. A generation ago it would have seemed impossible.

American Jewry has long been an important center of Jewish population; it is fast becoming also an important center of Jewish cultural and spiritual life.

Jewish Welfare and the Welfare Funds

By STANLEY RABINOWITZ

TWELVE hundred delegates to the United Jewish Appeal Conference held mid-December in Atlantic City established a minimum goal of $250,000,000 partially to meet the 1948 needs of its constituent units, the United Palestine Appeal, the Joint Distribution Committee, and the United Service for New Americans. To the needs of the U.J.A. will be added the needs of diverse national organizations devoted to welfare, defense, education and health, as well as the budgets of local agencies in each community. The total quota for overseas, national and local units will probably approximate $350,000,000.

Despite our unprecedented giving during the war years, no inhabitant of this blessed land has the right to resent united Jewry's demand that we give of our many bounties for the sake of bringing a measure of restitution to the helpless victims of Nazi terror, and for the sacred task of rebuilding a legally sanctioned Zion.

The U.J.A. provides a beacon of light to the forlorn Jewish survivors of the Nazi holocaust and is performing its sacred task magnificently. Even the most callous of humans could not fail but be moved by the promotional program prepared by the U.J.A. in furthering its 1947 campaign. Who was not impressed by full-page advertisements displaying soul-stirring photographs of a pallid, ill clad child under the heading, "What shall we do about Josef?" The descriptive copy was no less heart-rending than the photographs. . . . "It's cold in the Displaced Persons Camp. There's not much food . . . nor the right kinds of food for a small boy like Josef and his kid sister, Sarah. The last time Josef and Sarah saw their parents was when the Nazis bayoneted them. They'd have bayoneted the children too . . . only they ran and hid. . . ."

Riders on the United Jewish Appeal

No one but the irredeemably calloused could fail to be affected by the story of Josef. And no one with an ounce of integrity and a smattering of information could fail to ask himself, "What has Josef to do with the Jewish Welfare Board, the major portion of whose budget goes into the furtherance of the programs of Jewish Centers and Y.M.H.A.'s, and what has Josef's kid sister Sarah to do with the Joint Defense Appeal whose entire budget is devoted to combating anti-Jewish prejudice in America?" Yet a portion of every dollar contributed ostensibly for the relief of Josef and Sarah in 1947 was allocated to the Jewish Welfare Board and the Joint Defense Appeal to make comfortable American Jews still more comfortable. But the ad copy says nothing about these two organizations, nor about any of the many other organizations that received their incomes as a sort of "royalty" from the U.J.A. drives.

This year, no doubt, the promotional emphasis in the 1948 U.J.A. campaign will center about building and defending that area of Palestine which the United Nations has designated for Jewish development. This year, no doubt, little Josef and Sarah of the D.P. camp will give way, or, at least, will share the spot-light with Avram, Haganah scout, or with little Nahum, D.P. orphan, who is safe, at last, in Eretz Yisrael. Yet, if last year's ad copy is any criterion, nothing will be mentioned about the B'nai B'rith Wider Scope, the Jewish Consumptives' Relief Association

in Los Angeles, the Jewish Theological Seminary, the Hebrew Union College, nor the Yeshivah, just a few of the many beneficiaries of the U.J.A. drives in local areas none of which have even the remotest relationships to Avram of the Hanagah or Nahum, the orphan.

The unmistakable conclusion is that our local and national institutions are trading on the misery of European Jewry and riding the coat-tails of the appeal for funds in behalf of a Jewish state in Palestine. The fact that the major portion of the monies are allocated to the needs of U.J.A. does not change the principle of this conclusion.

In the Spring, 1947, issue of the *Menorah Journal,* Henry Hurwitz discussed the evil of this arrangement, but only as it pertains to New York City. In New York's 1947 U.J.A. campaign for $65,000,000, the Joint Defense Appeal, (consisting of the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith) the American Jewish Congress, the National Jewish Welfare Board and the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, were included as beneficiaries. Yet in all of the public appeals the sole stress was laid upon the urgent and crying needs of the surviving Jewish population in Europe, emigration into Palestine and the work of colonization there. Moreover, we learn from his article that "these organizations were arbitrarily tacked on by the small group of men who are running the campaign in New York, as the result of behind-closed-doors pressures that have nothing whatsoever to do with either the merits, the needs or the programs of the Joint Distribution Committee, the United Palestine Appeal and the United Service for New Americans."

Mr. Hurwitz asks, "By whose authority were those few favored organizations tacked on to the humanitarian campaign addressed to Christians as well as Jews?"

Objectionable Allocation Methods Not Confined to New York

He applies this question to the New York situation exclusively, believing as he does that in other communities the allocations of charity funds are managed by democratically elected bodies and that hence, "the beneficiaries of the local Welfare Funds are not just a few organizations, selected through pressure and politics behind closed doors."

Would that this were so! True, the allocations committee is democratically selected, the doors of the allocations chambers are theoretically open, and any recognized Jewish agency can receive a hearing. Nevertheless, the situation in "all-in-one-campaign" communities is virtually as objectionable as that which exists in New York. The questions which Mr. Hurwitz puts to New York can be put to other communities with equal justification.

The allocations committee may be democratically constituted, but, thanks to the conflict of interests represented, funds are allocated on the basis of log-rolling pressures (I'll vote for your allocation if you vote for mine), in which merits and budgets are subordinated to the power and nuisance value which a particular cause may possess.

Advantages and Disadvantages at the Present Federated Aproach

This is but one of the patent evils that accompany the federated approach in raising funds for charity. There are others. To consider but a few:

1. Contributors treat the Federated Fund* as a single entity, learn nothing about the needs of each beneficiary organization and relegate their obligation

* The terms "Federation" and "Welfare Funds" are used interchangeably to connote all "all-in-one" charity campaigns for Jewish causes.

to become informed about American Jewish institutions to the allocations committee. The abbreviations, UAHC, ORT, JDA, JWB, JTS, USNA, JDC, UPA, are meaningless to the average contributor and might just as well represent governmental agencies of the New Deal decade for all that he knows of their meaning. Of the programs and ideologies they represent he knows even less.

2. By virtue of his making his contribution not to a movement but to a local federation office, the contributor loses touch with the national office of the beneficiary organization and thus forfeits his right to influence the policies of the national agency. For this reason our national agencies are no longer sensitive to popular will, for they have no contact with the masses of Jewry, but only with the federation workers or the chosen few on the allocations committee. As it is now, organizations can afford to ride ruthlessly over the sensitivities of the masses if they feel they have the loyal support of two or three leaders on the allocation committee.

3. Because a contributor has no control over the allocation of his gift, he will often find that he is contributing to causes that are mutually contradictory in their approach or to causes toward which he may feel little sympathy and even strong opposition.

4. The overwhelming emotional weight of the appeal for overseas Jewry has completely submerged the valid claims of other important institutions for support. The orientation of this article has been in protest against the policy of diverting monies raised for U.J.A. into other channels. An equally valid case could be made defending the rights of other institutions. It is unfair to the Reform, Orthodox, and Conservative movements to toss them a few grains of spoil as a reward for submerging themselves in the larger appeal.

5. At the present time, when the assigned goal is not reached or when all pledges are not paid, the allocations committee must meet to revise its pre-campaign allocations. In his article in the *Menorah Journal,* Mr. Hurwitz demands that "not a dollar should be distributed to any of those extra beneficiaries before the full $65,000,000 originally sought (in New York) for the three constituents of the United Jewish Appeal alone, is secured. If the full amount of $65,000,000 is not raised in New York, then nothing should accrue to the tacked on organizations." A reasonable request in view of U.J.A.'s desperate need.

Mr. Hurwitz assumes that in communities with "democratic" allocations committees not one cent is given to tacked on organizations until U.J.A. needs are met. This is not so. The usual practice in all communities when the total goal is not reached is to accept the pre-campaign allocation to non-U.J.A. agencies with a resultant scaling down of the pre-campaign allocation to U.J.A. While this procedure may be justified in that the budgets of non-U.J.A. organization must also be raised, it amounts to giving American organizations the right to maintain themselves "on the backs of D.P. babies."

The advantages of the federated approach are many. The idea of federating all charitable drives into one was the result of the plethora of national and local drives that converted the year into a twelve month fund raising campaign. The federated approach offered the advantage of effecting greater economies in fund raising and of lessening the number of campaigns in each community. To that extent the federation idea is justified. It is in the allocations system that the federated approach loses its advantages and, in its striving to serve noble ends, is forced to resort to ignoble means.

In discussing this question, Rabbi

Robert Gordis sums up the dilemma of the average contributor, "whether to oppose the evils and run the risk of weakening mass loyalty to the larger cause, or to acquiesce in the situation for the sake of the elements of value in the over-all picture. Either horn of the dilemma is tremendously uncomfortable."

Unless one is prepared to offer a solution to this seemingly insoluble dilemma, criticism of the present situation in welfare funds assumes destructive proportions, which is not a pretty prospect in this year of need.

An obvious solution suggests itself. If the federated approach is proper in fund raising but improper in fund allocating, then let us retain the unity resulting from federating for the collecting of funds, but let each contributor exercise his inalienable right to allocate his contribution in terms of his own preference. As one complainant wrote to the *Menorah Journal*, "There is no one more qualified to spend my money than myself. Why should I be compelled to make a contribution to the Republican Party if I am a Democrat?"

An Alternative Method of Allocation

The first step in solving this dilemma must be to concede the patent wrong of the present approach. The techniques of a new approach can be best settled over the conference table. One possible solution might be the following:

Each contributor should receive a brochure, pamphlet, or even a sheet of paper, at the time he makes his pledge, containing a listing of each beneficiary institution together with a thumb-nail sketch describing the ideology of the institution, its activities and accomplishments and the salient items in its budget.

The allocations committee should still have the right to determine which organizations should be included as beneficiary organizations, so as not to overwhelm the contributor with the curse of the "long ballot." For the sake of greater freedom there should even be a space to allow contributors to write in the names of organizations not listed on the official allocation schedule. The selection of beneficiary institutions and the material describing them should be prepared on the basis of the information and studies released by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (C.J.F.W.F.).

Basic to the entire approach in charitable campaigns today is the feeling that supporting Jewish institutions partakes not only of charity but of the nature of a tax imposed by the Jewish community on its members, legitimately imposed by virtue of the right of any group to seek every means of maintaining itself in the face of crisis. Therefore, it would seem just for the allocations committee to take steps to preclude the possibility of a contributor's ear-marking his entire gift for a single cause or institution and leaving other agencies without essential support. The schedule of recipient organizations should be categorized, perhaps, as follows: (a) Overseas; (b) Civic Protective; (c) Religious and Cultural; (d) Health; (e) Coordination and Research; (f) Local.

A percentile key should be assigned to each category. Contributors should be advised to divide their contribution in terms of the percentile key. In that the campaign assumes the nature of a voluntary tax for the maintenance of essential institutions, this measure of control over contributions is valid. However, within each category the contributor should have complete freedom in deciding his allocation. Thus, if a 5 percent quota is assigned to the "Civic Protective" category, the $100 contributor may assign $5.00 to any one or any number of institutions in that category that represents his philosophy,

ignoring all those agencies with which he feels little sympathy. In this manner every area of Jewish life would receive support, but the support received by each institution would be commensurate with its following in the community.

To preclude the possibility of leaving local agencies without support, the contribution made to local institutions and agencies should not be subject to personal allocation. Here the "taxation" approach is essential. Once a local agency is placed on the approved schedule, its budgeted allocation should be guaranteed in so far as this is possible. The assignment of percentile key of 10 percent for local agencies in a community where $1,000,000 is raised would earmark $100,000 for all local agencies and administration. The percentile figure will vary, of necessity, in each community.

The research department of the C.J.F.W.F. could provide invaluable assistance in advising each community on the formulation of the percentile key which would best meet the needs of that community. Perhaps this is the answer to the question of national budgeting.

Of course, some contributors will refuse to avail themselves of the opportunity to assign their own allocations. In these cases, unallocated contributions should still be divided by the allocations committee in the manner it sees fit.

This may sound complicated. There certainly is room for improvement in the mechanics of the plan. But more important than agreement on techniques is agreement on the basic principle which applies to charity drives no less than to others. That principle is that, in order to achieve a mature and responsible Jewish community, the widest possible mass participation should be secured in formulating community policies. Every means should, therefore, be exploited to educate the members of the Jewish community to understand the needs of our people and the value of satisfying those needs.

Perhaps this is what the editorial in *The Reconstructionist* of November 28, 1947, sought to convey. "Vast sums of money are expended; much energy is invested in these annual—almost continuous — drives. But unless the process of fund-raising and fund-spending is used to educate the Jewish people in the purposes of these enterprises, and unless the ethical and spiritual calibre of Jewry is raised by means of them, a magnificent opportunity is lost. The purposes that are served by these drives represent the very substance of what we mean by the term 'Jewish Life.' If Jews are to live intelligently, they must be given more than a minimum knowledge and emotional stimulation necessary to persuade them to part with their money."

Advantages of the Suggested Plan

The plan which is herein suggested is an attempt to do away with the evils of fund-allocations from above without destroying the efficiency and the unity achieved by the federated approach.

Under the suggested plan many of the defects of the federated approach are removed. The contributor will be educated to identify and understand the various Jewish institutions serving the Jewish people. The UAHC, ORT, JDA, JWB, USNA will become living movements with dynamic purposes, instead of a maze of alphabetical mumbo-jumbo. The contributor will realize that the American Jewish Congress may have an approach toward improving inter-group relations that differs from that of the American Jewish Committee. At campaign season, pulpit and press, club and lodge, and, above all, the very process of self-allocation will educate each contributor to the needs and values of Jewish life and the

programs of the organizations seeking to satisfy those needs.

The intelligent and sensitive contributor could afford the luxury of consistency in making his allocations, as he would allocate his contribution to those institutions with which he is in sympathy. A "Republican" will no longer find it necessary to contribute to a "Democratic" campaign-chest.

The contributor would no longer be a prisoner of self-appointed leaders or well meaning allocations committees. The obnoxious practice of log-rolling, inevitable in the system of allocations by committees would be ended.

Institutions representing a specific ideology would have an opportunity to present their points of view to the contributing public and would thereby increase the number of their respective followers. In fact, the local Federation office could easily provide each recipient institution with the names and addresses of contributors who earmark a portion of their contribution to it. Thus each institution would know not only how much support it receives from each community but who its supporters are. Self-allocation with its resultant self-education would accrue to the benefit of the many smaller but very important institutions lacking the glamor and the public appeal of the U.J.A.

National agencies would be forced to bcome more sensitive to the popular will, for they would now be concerned with the support of the masses rather than with the support of the chosen few on the allocations committee.

There would be an end to the objectionable system by which income derived from an advertised appeal for the D.P.s or some other popular cause is diverted to causes totally unrelated to the advertised purpose. Contributions to the U.J.A. would go exclusively to the U.J.A. A contribution by a Christian, who is not a taxable member of the Jewish community, would not be used to support Jewish-communal institutions. Each contributor would be a party to distributing a portion of his own gift to other agencies which, though unrelated to the U.J.A. are still of great importance to the Jewish community. Each cause and institution would receive funds commensurate with the size of its popular support and not commensurate with its nuisance value, as is now the case.

Some Objections Considered

Will the suggested plan weaken the strength of Federations and Welfare Funds? No, it will rather strengthen them, for the federated approach offers recipient institutions the advantage of low cost and efficient fund-raising. And since each institution would receive support commensurate with its public following it would no longer find an advantage in leaving the Federation and conducting its own fund-raising campaign. The sole reason why many institutions refuse Federation support is that they fear not only that their identity will be lost but that the measure of support given them by the Federation will be less than the public support they could muster by their own efforts.

Will the suggested plan increase the cost of federated campaigns? It may increase clerical costs slightly. Education, however, is always expensive, but we Jews have always believed education to be essential and, therefore, worth its cost.

Will the suggested plan cut down contributions? No, the amount of individual contributions is more likely to increase. A man may feel that a gift of $100 to a charity is sufficient (and most people look at the "Welfare Fund" as just *one* charity) but if, in making his allocation, he discovers that a $100 contribution may be translated into only $1.00 for the B'nai

B'rith Wider Scope, or for the Yeshiva College, he will be compelled to revise his thinking and perhaps his giving. By specifying amounts to each cause and giving the total to the Welfare Fund, a man will be apt to give much more money than if he gives a sum to the Federation and lets others break it down for him into constituent portions. The cost of education will thus pay for itself in increased gifts.

But the suggested plan will compel each organization to spend much more money on publicity and public relations than it does now. If so, charge that to education. However, there is so much money spent by each organization on public relations as it is, that the public relations programs will need redirection rather than expansion. (Incidenally, the thumb-nail description of each organization included on the pledge sheet should indicate the amount of money spent by each organization in order to collect its funds. Any organization that spends 40 cents to collect each $1.00, as some do now, cannot be considered an organization worthy of support.)

I have no illusions that this suggested plan will receive universal acclaim. I concede many weaknesses in the plan that I suggest. But then, it is always easier to analyze than to synthesize. But despite its seemingly destructive character, my criticism aims to be constructive. Destructive analysis is essentially constructive, because any dislocation that it may cause is only temporary, but in leading to rethinking it becomes in the long run con-

(*Continued on Page* 30)

Jeremiah Weeping

By HELEN JOY WEINBERG

O Lord, I love this people but alas
Have not the patience of Thy tender heart,
And so I weep—not for their slavery,
But that too easily their flame is dulled
By softness and by receptivity.

A title here, some wine there in a cup,
Can cause them to forget they ever knew
The rocky wastes where Thou didst speak with them.
Too easily, O Lord, they do adopt
The smooth pretensions of an alien land.

I plunge my mind down through the centuries
And see Thy glory vanished from their eyes,
Their faces molded to a newer cast
And souls cramped to a stipulated size.

O Lord, 'tis not their hardships that I fear,
But that contentment may snuff out their strength.
So, if Thou love them, I entreat Thee, God,
Throw thorns upon their onward path nor let
Thy father's tenderness provide oblivion's salve.

Kurt Lewin – The Man and the Psychologist

By NOAH NARDI

The possibility of reconstructing Jewish life depends on the possibility of changing the social habits and attitudes of men. It is thus dependent on an effective application of social psychology. No one has contributed more to this field of psychological research and methodology than Kurt Lewin. The following is the first of a series of three articles dealing with his life and work, especially in its application to the problems of Jewish reconstruction. In forthcoming issues, Dr. Nardi will discuss some of Dr. Lewin's methods as applied by him and others to problems of Jewish interest and how those methods could be utilized in Jewish education.

THE purpose of this article is to pay tribute to a friend and master. The present writer had the privilege of knowing Kurt Lewin personally and of enjoying association with him. He planned and discussed with Dr. Lewin a number of far-reaching projects in Jewish education, and it is with a feeling of deep personal loss that this is being written.

What Made Lewin a Zionist

Lewin was born in Germany and was raised on a farm close to the Polish frontier. He did not have much Jewish education, and his Zionism sprang both from his love of nature and from a number of anti-Semitic incidents in his family history, especially as they affected his youngest brother, Fritz. Zionism to him was a sociological necessity. He thought that there must be a limit even to Jewish persecutions, and that in the same way as the Irishman may always return to Ireland and the Italian to Italy, the Jew, at least psychologically, must have the alternative of Palestine as a country where he would have the necessary feeling of belongingness. Palestine, he thought, is the only place where Jews can develop normally and be close to nature.

Hardened as we have become to anti-Jewish manifestations, there may not seem anything unusual in his brother's plight. Fritz enlisted in the German Army during the first World War and served as a pre-flight pilot. He was not permitted to graduate because of his Jewishness, but this did not prevent him from being killed later in action.

In his youth, Lewin was active in socialist student organizations and did not have many Zionist or other Jewish contacts. Many of his student friends became scientists and college instructors, and he himself was kept by the University of Berlin as instructor in psychology. Those were the formative years of Lewin's scientific career, and his interest even then was centered around problems of culture and group life. During the early twenties Lewin pioneered in the development of an experimental psychology of motivation and wrote two books on the comparative theory of science: "The Concept of Genesis" and "The Concept of Relationships." Berlin, during those years, was the seat of the group of well-known psychologists out of which the Gestalt School of Psychology came into being. Lewin's collaboration with Wertheimer, Koehler, Koffka, and other original Gestaltists at the University of Berlin make him, indeed, one of their corroborators if not a disciple. His contributions, however, are those of an original thinker rather than of a follower.

Those happy years of his at the University of Berlin were soon interrupted by the emergence of Nazi anti-Semitism after World War I and the events which were directed to shaking the Weimar Re-

public. Rosa Luxemburg was murdered, Rathenau assassinated, and Lewin and his Jewish colleagues were suddenly awakened to the realization that there was no future for them or for any other Jew in Germany. He withdrew from the German socialist and liberal organizations and began to make friends with the *Juedische Rundschau* circles. In the year of Hitler's rise to power (in 1932), Lewin was visiting professor at Stanford University and also lectured in Japan. When he returned to Germany, Lewin saw that he could not remain there any any longer. Wolfgang Koehler, his superior at the Berlin University, suggested to Lewin that, because of his war record, it might be possible for him to keep his job and escape the fate of the other Jewish professors who were being dismissed at that time one by one. Koehler was anxious not to lose Lewin, but Lewin had made up his mind. He left that year (1933) for the United States, where he taught at Cornell and Harvard and later became professor of psychology at the Child Welfare Research Station at the University of Iowa.

Lewin's Services to America During and After the War

During the war he served as counsellor to the Division of Program Surveys of the United States Department of Agriculture. He was also consultant in the Office of Strategic Services in Washington and Vice-President of the Institute of Ethnic Affairs, as well as President of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues. In 1945 he became director of the Research Institute for Group Dynamics which was founded at that time at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. At the time of his death, he was engaged in a comparative study of all aspects of group life — industry, community life, minority problems and government administration. His latest undertaking was to be a very important military project, which he was requested to develop for the United States Navy.

Lewin and the Hebrew University

Lewin was probably the outstanding figure in present-day psychology. At the fifty-fourth annual meeting of the American Psychological Association held in Philadelphia, Professor Gardner Murphy in a public address referred to him as "the one who has written some of the most brilliant pages in present-day American psychology." In spite of all the opportunities for professional and personal advancement which Lewin could foresee for himself in the United States, his heart was set on Palestine and he gladly accepted the offer of the Hebrew University to come to Jerusalem to organize its Department of Psychology. Lewin was very elated over this offer. He saw in it a wonderful opportunity for research and felt that he could contribute greatly to the analysis and solution of the many sociological and cultural problems which confront the Jewish community in Palestine.

Dr. Alexander M. Dushkin, Executive Vice-President of the Jewish Education Committee of New York, who in 1934 was called to organize the Education Department of the Hebrew University, reports an interesting conversation he had with Lewin at that time. When he asked Lewin why he was ready to leave his very well-equipped laboratories at Iowa for a poor, hard and less remunerative career in Palestine, Lewin's answer was: "Two reasons impel me to work in Jerusalem. One is personal. I have been deeply hurt and challenged by Hitler, and feel that I must make my own personal answer to that challenge in the most positive and dramatic form possible by identifying myself wtih the Return to Zion. The other reason is scientific. Once in a

thousand years and more does history present so marvelous a laboratory for experimental work in social psychology as is offered in our day in the new Palestine. There, in a small compact area are so many different cultural and social strata, so many varieties of background and aspiration, so many tensions, so much courage and vision, so much obstinate zeal, so many tangential points with all of humanity and its myriad social problems! That is the laboratory for me! Compared to that, all that which America can offer me in machinery and in opportunity is scientifically pale and prosaic. I think I can make a real contribution; I am eager to try. . . ."

He was ready to undergo a great many hardships, but on one thing he could not compromise, namely, a minimal request for laboratory and staff, without which he felt that his contribution would be made worthless. The University at that time was much too poor to provide Lewin with that opportunity and Lewin remained in Iowa where he carried out remarkable experiments in early childhood behavior and in group reeducation and leadership. Lewin felt that he was of no good to Jerusalem without his "tools," that he could not limit himself to lecture and arm-chair psychology. However, Lewin did not give up the idea of Palestine very easily. He wanted to raise money in America for the establishment in Jerusalem of a research center similar to that of Iowa. He organized a special fund-raising committee with Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt as chairman, but nothing materialized from this effort.

Jewish Researches in America

Not being able to go to Palestine, Lewin decided to devote himself to Jewish research in America. He was very much concerned with problems of Jewish maladjustment and with the extent to which the Jew is ready to accept himself as a member of a minority group. Being a great believer in the possibilities of reeducation, he felt that the solution to the problem of maladjustment lies not so much in combating Gentile, anti-Semitic prejudices as in the changing of attitudes of the Jew toward himself, giving him an appreciation of his own worth and dignity. Positive and constructive acceptance of one's Jewishness, he felt, could not be achieved without the development of the sense of belongingness and identification with the Jewish group.

Lewin's interest in Jewish social research led to the establishment in 1945 of the Commission on Community Interrelations by the American Jewish Congress. This Commission provided Lewin with a generous budget and gave him the opportunity to serve the Jewish people through the development of a research-action program for the treatment of anti-Semitism. The methods and techniques of group dynamics which he and his colleagues at the University of Iowa and at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology had developed in the study and the change of attitudes in industry, health and social work thus found their way to the Jewish field as well. Being both a scientist and a devoted Jew, Lewin considered it his prime duty to find ways and means for the application of his theories and techniques to the problems of the Jewish minority. It was, therefore, only natural for Lewin, while outlining plans for a United Nations' international organization of group dynamics, to think of the Jewish problems as well. Consequently, he conceived the idea and proceeded with plans for the organization of a Jewish international institute of action-research with offices in every Jewish center in the diaspora. Fantastic as this may sound, Lewin was very close to the realization of this fascinating pro-

ject and, in fact, a few days before his death, at a parlor meeting in the home of one of the leading Jewish philanthropists in Boston, Lewin was offered the initial sums which he deemed necessary for launching the project.

Cool and objective as he was as a scientist, Lewin used to get very upset and emotional in matters concerning the Jewish people. He hated, and hated intensely, anybody who hated Jews—be he a Gentile or a Jew. Lewin developed a kind of personal feud with Bevin and with the British Empire, and, in his public addresses he always looked for opportunities to pass slurring remarks on the foreign policy of the British Labor Government. He felt deeply hurt by Bevin and his policies and, from the numerous conversations we had with him on this subject, it was our impression that Bevin may have had a great deal to do with his sudden collapse. He was very proud of his daughter Esther's return to Palestine after the completion of her studies in America, and he himself was getting ready to go there on some kind of a mission on behalf of the Jewish Agency which would have involved work on important aspects of the manifold socio-psychological problems of Palestine.

He loved America and cherished its democratic way of life. American Jews, he thought, have contributed and will continue to contribute greatly to the American democracy.

Lewin's Scientific Pioneering

Lewin, as a social scientist was a pioneer in many important areas of research. He had a deep faith in the scientific method and maintained that there is nothing in human experience that cannot be experimented with scientifically. He tried to develop research techniques whereby not only overt human reactions could be studied and subjected to change, but also states of mind, emotions, aspiration, social atmosphere, group cohesion, etc. He was a man of daring imagination and the scope and breadth of his vision was very often a source of bewilderment to his colleagues. Lewin was far ahead of the rest of the social scientists in America, and it took his colleagues in some instances years of research and hard thinking to fully appreciate some of Lewin's ideas. He envisaged action-research on a world-wide scale and was working with a United Nations committee on plans whereby application of the social science techniques would aid towards the solution of world ills.

Lewin's interests ran along two directions which are really part of the same pattern. He was very much concerned with problems affecting group life and, as a result, had been trying to develop a systematic theory of psychology which he presented in his two books: "Principles of Topological Pyschology" and "Measurement of Psychological Forces," as well as in a series of monographs, "Topological and Vector Psychology."

What Lewin had in mind is not a new system of psychology limited to a specific content, but rather a "tool" or set of concepts by means of which one could represent psychological reality. There is no way at present to formulate scientifically what Lewin calls "psychological life space." Studies of environmental influences are usually classified in terms of statistical averages or percentages. A dynamic theory of psychology, however, cannot use this form of description; it is in need of a mathematical system in which forces can be expressed in more than the usual dimensions and which could represent the personality and the state of a person as the total of possible and not possible ways of behaving. Mathematics, according to Lewin, in the course of its history, has developed a concept of space

which in no way is limited to physical space or to a space which can be visualized.

The Field Theory and Group Dynamics

Lewin's theories of group dynamics stem from his social and mathematical conception of the field theory. The field theory as a rule starts from the characterization of the situation as a whole. It presupposes that each field has properties which are characteristic to it as a whole and not in its parts. A field is a unit that can include not only microscopic, but also macroscopic situations, among them time factors that range from minutes to many years, and space factors that would extend for thousands of miles. This is especially true of the Jewish psychological field which bears the influence of a very long history and tradition and which extends in space as far as Palestine. Field properties may be expressed not only in physical but in psychological terms as well. These, according to Lewin, can be measured quite as accurately as physical situations, including properties such as social atmosphere, friendliness, security and the like.

What does all this mean from the practical point of view? It means that an individual cannot be viewed independently from his social group; that the group, in turn, like any other field, possesses characteristics of its own and that the behavior of either a group or individual is a result of many factors, visible and non-visible; that these factors can be either of momentary duration or can extend far into the past or the future. Applying the field theory to group dynamics, we assume that a group is not merely the sum total of its individuals, but possesses characteristics of its own. Indeed, a group made up of strong-willed individuals is not necessarily stronger but may even be weaker than a group composed of a mixture of strong-willed and weak-willed personalities. Similarly, the behavior of the individual is determined by the behavior of the group and, before an individual can be re-educated, he must be melted first into a group and changed with the group. In other words, it may be easier to affect the character of a whole group, than that of one individual treated separately. "I do not hesitate to predict," said Lewin, "that group work—that is, the handling of human beings not as isolated individuals, but in the social setting of groups—will soon be one of the important theoretical and practical fields."

The group approach is of comparatively recent origin. It was started about 1935 by Lewin and his students at the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station with studies of children's clubs and spread to other groups such as Boy Scouts, college students and housewives, and was utilized in the fields of nutrition and industry. It has since developed into an experimental science of group dynamics, with special emphasis on problems of leadership and leadership training, motivation, group morale and group re-education. During this short period, special techniques have been developed to register objectively and to describe reliably the social aspects of behavior. Experiments in the social aspects of inter-personal behavior have been found to be very useful in the training for leadership. They have shown that the ability to perceive subtle changes in the social atmosphere of the group is the prerequisite of good leadership or good teaching; and that good leadership in one organization is not necessarily good leadership in another organization.

Closely related to the problem of leadership is the type of social atmosphere that prevails in the group. Lewin was very much concerned with the relation between

autocracy, democracy, and individualistic freedom in group situations. To him, democracy was not a compromise between autocratic discipline and lawlessness. On the contrary, the democratic leader to him is not less a leader and has not less power than the autocratic leader. An efficient and "tough" democracy is still a democracy and an autocracy with a democratic front is still an autocracy. A democratic atmosphere, whether in a classroom or a factory, was shown to be very beneficial to its members and most conducive to changes from hostility to friendliness and from egocentricity to cooperation. Indeed, achievement standards set up by the group itself need not necessarily be lower than those ordered by an authority. On the contrary, "team decisions" are usually very effective in raising production. One must remember, however, that discussions only, without proper decisions, are merely a waste of time and do not lead to marked accomplishments. In the classroom, therefore, no talk about democratic ideals can take the place of a democratic atmosphere. The changing of the social atmosphere in a group from autocratic to democratic leadership is one of the prerequisites of group dynamics and experiments have shown that a group atmosphere can be changed radically in a relatively short time through the introduction of new leadership techniques.

This principle is equally true of a small group as of a very large one, i.e., a nation. On the problem of re-education of Germany, Lewin points out that it is a fallacy to assume that a people, if left alone, will follow a democratic pattern in their group life. Autocracy can easily be imposed, but not democracy. Democracy must be learned through a voluntary process. The group work aproach to the re-education of Germany would consist, therefore, of training democratic leaders who, in turn, would train leaders of leaders so that a pyramid which could teach large masses of people could quickly be built up.

Leo Baeck and German Jewry

On His Seventy-Fifth Birthday—May 23

By MAX WIENER

A RELIGIOUS leader is as different from a political chieftain, as religion is from politics. Politics, the struggle for power in communal life, need not necessarily mar the personality of him who engages in it. Yet since victory is essential to a political career. the politician too often succumbs to the temptation of employing dubious means to win it. Men are inclined to overlook or to forget his methods and to heed his accomplishments only.

Baeck's Religious Leadership

In the field of religious leadership, everything depends on the uncompromising integrity of the religious personality. Such is the miracle of personality, that it effects much more by its mere being than by its doing. This is not said to minimize what, for more than half a century, Leo Baeck has done as a rabbi and preacher, as a scholar and writer, as a teacher and educator of rabbinical students, as an organizer and communal worker. However, the humane character of Dr. Baeck overshadows all he has done and the style of his individuality has coined his every word and action.

He has been a liberal rabbi for more than five decades. During this era, Ger-

man Jewry, though perhaps losing its foremost place in world-Jewry, a place which it had maintained through two generations, stood at the climax of its cultural development. It was emancipated and assimilated up to the danger point, where an observer, not without reason, could speak of the nearing end. Most of the important congregations were devoted to the trend inaugurated by Abraham Geiger and his followers. Orthodoxy, which had been revitalized in the days of *Hakham* Bernays in Hamburg, S. R. Hirsch in Frankfort-on-the-Main and Asriel Hildesheimer in Berlin, though by no means sterile in its thinking, had virtually given up the hope of regaining its deserters. It was satisfied to have retained the rest of its followers, who now and then were reinforced by an influx of Jews from the East. The rising wave of nationalism, which violently attacked the religious liberalism that had been taught by the modernists, was stirring up vehement quarrels in the Jewish fold, which numbered hardly more than half a million people. The liberal rabbinate was the special target of the militant Zionists, who, being for the most part estranged from religious values, assailed it as the exponent of a kind of Judaism neither capable nor worthy of survival. This controversy was waged on German soil under the influence of a milieu accustomed to looking on all spiritual differences from the viewpoint of "eternal verities." Reconciliation and harmony seemed to be impossible.

The community as such, in contradistinction to Jewish organizations in this country, was an exclusively religious congregation, to which according to the law of the state all Jews of a city or town belonged. It was thus a compulsory association, consisting of men with various shades of religious opinion, from fiery Zionists to hardly less stubborn "Germans of Jewish belief." Thus the task of the liberal rabbi was complicated. It was at any rate much more difficult than the rabbinical office in the few strictly traditional congregations or in the one Reform Society, which were supported by homogeneous memberships. The "liberal" leader had to be either a politician, in the sense of politics as "the art of the possible," a determined party-man, with little consideration for a dissenting minority or else a neutral, one who, for the sake of peace and sometimes for the sake of his own comfort and convenience, avoided taking any outspoken position.

The Character of Baeck's Liberalism

Baeck, though a man who knows the world and has always kept his eyes open to facts and realities, is so far from any radicalism that his conduct has conformed to the dictum of a wise man who said: "Radicalism is a defect of thinking." He does not like parties, defined by programs, but believes that Judaism can and should be experienced as a whole, in which national and religious, traditional and progressive elements are indissolubly fused. But—let there be no mistake about it—his is not the attitude of a spectator who, seeing that the community is split into several ideological sections, arrives at the conclusion that each of them is relatively entitled to its own viewpoint. Such might be the attitude of an impartial observer from the outside who is impressed by the vigor and manifest sincerity of different philosophies; or it might represent the guiding principle of a communal leader who has to get along with people of vigorous opinions and utilize them for the common good—politics in a good sense, but still politics!

It must, however, be possible to be liberal and yet conservative, to join national with religious impulses. That is Baeck's Jewish ideal. It can be carried out

only by and in a mind that, on principle, is averse to any kind of dogmatism. Dogmatism is the attempt to cast in fixed formulas what, according to its innermost nature, resists any scientific formulation. Mere intellect is often not aware of its own situation. One often finds among the masters of theological dogmatism intellects of the highest order. They lack one thing only, a truly conscientious judgment applied to the fundamentals of their activity. What is necessary is wisdom. Wisdom, without rendering its owner skeptical regarding the possible achievements of mind, acknowledges the limits of reason by virtue of a certain spiritual elasticity. If religious liberalism has a positive significance, if it aims not only at the disintegration of traditionalism, but also at the upbuilding of a new dogmatic edifice on the ruins of the old, then it must rest on the insight wisdom alone is able to grant.

Baeck's liberalism is of that sort. It is not a viewpoint conforming to party lines. Rather is it the attitude of a man to whom ideas and their representatives open up vast vistas, the ultimate meaning of which cannot be covered by a trite phrase or popular catchword, but needs to be acquired anew by honest and laborious seeking.

It is remarkable that such a stand, though it is rarely encountered, is often gratefully acknowledged and appreciated by people who find themselves in different, and even in hostile camps. Baeck has been the great moderator of German Jewry because his liberalism was felt to be saturated with the substance of Judaism. He commanded respect from all groups and wings, and for decades it became a matter of course that the most important tasks of communal leadership should be entrusted to him. The General Rabbinical Association, encompassing rabbis of all shades except a few of the "Separation Orthodoxy," could develop fruitful activities under him. He headed the German district of the B'nai B'rith Lodge until its destruction. At an utterly critical time he was appointed president of the Reich Organization of the German Jews. Though he was a member of the governing board of the *"Centralverein Deutscher Staatsbürger Jüdischen Glaubens"* (Central Association of German Citizens of Jewish Faith), the tendency of which is indicated by its name, he was at the same time a vigorous and successful advocate of the Palestine idea. It is no exaggeration to say that he carried interest in the national home into circles which had hitherto been either indifferent or hostile to it.

The Jews in the heyday of their emancipation were confronted with two ways of assimilation. The one aimed more or less consciously at complete self-obliteration. The other embraced the cultural achievements of the surrounding world in order thereby to enrich the Jewish heritage. The advantage of our being a minority is that we are compelled to take notice of whatever affects the life around us. It is therefore not surprising that a thorough familiarity with questions of universal culture is required of the thinking Jew in order that he may understand the Jewish idea as such. Baeck, as a critic of Jewish historiography, emphasizes the necessity of establishing a really clear and objective view of the course of our development on the basis of exact investigation into universal history. I do not refer here to scholarship in a specific field, but rather to Dr. Baeck's far-reaching and profound knowledge in all provinces of spiritual civilization. His knowledge which is always fused with highly intelligent judgment, has made him truly educated and cultured. The result is that

whatever he says and writes takes on a personal artistic style.

An Interpreter of Judaism to the Non-Jew

No wonder that these qualities have enabled him to become an effective interpreter of the Jewish mind for educated non-Jews. Good-will activities like those in this country were hardly developed in Germany. Baeck, however, is one of the very few who may be considered as well respected ambassadors of Jewish thought to foreigners. This influence was not restricted to certain circles of Protestant theologians. It is more important that his words reached considerable groups of educated laymen. He was an admired lecturer in Count Kayserling's "School of Wisdom." The present writer remembers the impression of Baeck's address at the bicentennary celebration of Moses Mendelssohn's birthday (1929). Before the highest state authorities in Berlin he displayed so colorful and, at the same time, so genuine a picture of the man, of his epoch, and of German Jewry of that day that the *Berliner Tageblatt,* then a leading German paper, characterized it as follows: "This speech was so different from all we are accustomed to hear on such occasions, so free from all cheap phrases and exaggerations, so clear and, at the same time, so beautifully formed, that the whole audience was spellbound. . . ."

Baeck indeed is a master of the essay, a true artist in portraying an historic personality or situation. He convinces the reader or listener by the psychological and sociological verisimilitude of his portraits.

Baeck's Ideal of the Rabbi and Scholar

It goes without saying that he who depicts spiritual realities always sees them, and therefore shows them, in the light of his own experiences and character. Unavoidable though this subjectivity is, it need not deprive the ideas described and evaluated of their inherent truth and intrinsic significance. For ideas are stronger than the mind of the individual, if he gives them his closest attention.

This is of particular consequence for a popular speaker. The preacher, too often, in the endeavor to make himself easily understood, oversimplifies what he has to say and destroys the very meaning of any deep idea. Occasionally this tendency, by its too low estimation of the audience, borders on pessimism and contempt. Baeck's faith in man shows itself in his trust not only in his own intelligence, but also in that of others. Above all he possesses too high a respect for thinking to surrender to the lack of thinking. He often held out as a precept for the professional ethics of the rabbi that he raise the level of his congregation instead of stepping down to vulgar truisms and cheap sensationalism. According to this rule he acted while a practicing rabbi and teacher of homiletics at the Berlin *Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums.* Certainly, the pulpit is not the place for discussing complicated problems, but the seriousness and devotion to his holy task which are demanded of the religious teacher must have their counterpart in the readiness and determination of the listeners to open wide their minds and souls. Baeck is convinced that a rabbi who has something to teach will succeed in transforming his public from a mere aggregation of people into a religious congregation, a holy body. This endeavor he regards as the predominant duty of the rabbi. Having been formed himself, by a thorough Jewish training, he feels that man's mental and ethical capacities, though different from each other, are virtually inseparable in a living personality, that judgment and discernment are integral to the ethical personality.

Attempting to characterize his scientific achievements, I am reminded of the opening words of a review of Adolf Harnack's famous "Lectures on the Essence of Christianity," which Dr. Baeck wrote in his youth. He said in effect: He who possesses enough learning to have respect for learning will deal with a work of Harnack with nothing but the greatest respect.—Why? Because the work of a real scholar means more than the technical mastery of methods and ways of research; it aims at the self-clarification of the scholarly mind itself. Baeck feels that seeking for truth, even for theoretical truth, is rooted in the innermost moral impulses.

That book review, by the way, though keeping strictly within the confines of literary criticism, aroused an echo in the political world. Baeck had shown how the liberal Christian theologian, in ignoring dogmatic embarrassments, arrived at an ethical doctrine, not very remote from that of Judaism. The *Kreuzzeitung,* the chief organ of the Prussian Conservatives and of Lutheran Orthodoxy, made use of the statement to attack the liberal Christian for his "Judaizing." Thus a discussion between Judaism and Christianity arose which was conducted on a very high level.

Baeck's Principal Writings

Baeck's systematic contribution to this problem is contained in his "Essence of Judaism," originally a comparatively slender volume which grew from edition to edition and is a mirror of the author's internal development through the decades. It reveals in its growth an increasing consideration of the facts and events which, constituting Jewish national life, are closely linked with Israel's ideas. The essence of Judaism is a religious spirit, essentially formed by God's commandment. This is to be understood in a literal, though not in any orthodox sense. For deepening insight becomes aware of the divine mystery in which the authority of God's command is established.

A great number of disquisitions, collected in the volume, "Out of Three Millenia" (*Aus drei Jahrtausenden*) form a kind of historical and philosophical commentary on that chief work. The English reader may find a selection of them in the book, "The Pharisees and Other Essays," which recently appeared in New York (Schocken Books). Many of them deal with the Jewish aspect of Christian belief. But his is not the simplifying attitude so often applied by modern rabbinical apologetes who, proceeding from the irrationality of Christian dogma, base the superiority of Jewish religion on the clarity and obviousness of its ethical principle. Baeck, well versed in the complexity of the antagonistic Christian systems, likes to examine them on their own merits and demerits. Of course, it is always the Jew who, from his viewspoint, passes judgment on Christian thought. However, the deep seriousness with which these Christian questions are treated as genuinely religious problems makes us more conscious of our own heritage. Among these writings, "The Gospels as a Document in the History of the Jewish Faith," deserves particularly to be mentioned. That religion in general should, and that Judaism does, possess an ethical kernel the neglect of which would destroy the very meaning of the belief in God does not make Baeck overlook the fact that religion exceeds the confines even of the noblest ethics. Thus he can understand both Jewish mysticism and Jewish legalism in their religious significance and can trace the ways of Judaism in the Church.

Baeck is a scrupulous thinker, averse to flimsy hypotheses and unwarranted opinions. But learning for him is more a means than an end. He does not represent that type of scholar who sits in an ivory tower,

ngaged only in studying. Learning be-ongs to the urgent duties of life, if life to be built up on a well founded hilosophy. As a religious man, he has aith in the vigor and efficacy of ideas, nd hence in the power of a spiritual ersonality. All his friends and disciples now that this confidence has proved true n the impression he has always made pon them.

The fate of our people in our time of-ered him an extraordinary opportunity or showing the seriousness of his religios-ity. The tragedy of German Jewry, a prelude to that of the European community, did not spare a single home or individual. He carried on up to the bitter end. He thus became a real comfort for those whose spokesman he was in darkest days. He has given to the whole Jewish world a demonstration of courage and righteousness. In the midst of recrudescent savagery and barbarism he saved our belief in human goodness and moral greatness. His attitude has verified the genuine vitality of an idea.

And I Shall Live . . .

By LIBBY M. KLAPERMAN

THEY call me Chayah. It's a pretty name, Chayah, and like it. When I first came here, I plead-d with them to give me a new name, give ne a new one and wipe away the old. Do you know what it means not to want our name, not to want yourself? No, no, ou can never know. Pray God that you vill never have to know.

And so my name is Chayah. They told ne—"Chayah means life" and you are Chayah and you shall live!

Do you know how old I am? I am oung, but oh, so old. I have been on his earth for so short a time, but my eyes ave seen much, and my feet have been verywhere. Everywhere—Treblinka, Os-viecim, Maidenek, Warsaw.

And I hear other feet going around nd I hear sighs and I hear voices, voices f those I loved so much. The voice of ny little brother—oh, my brother, you vere too young to hear the airplane with read. You were too young to hide and un and fear. Dearest little baby brother—t was I who gave you to them. Don't turn rom me; hear me out lest I burst with ny sorrow. Hear me, little brother, it was who gave you to them. Yes, my father they shot to death while he crossed a ghetto street; my mother leaped out of the window of a train carrying her to destruction. But my brother—I gave to them, I, I!

I remember when the notice appeared on the ghetto walls—all Jewish children should come to be vaccinated. So I dressed you, little brother, with loving care. I borrowed someone's suit, and someone else's shoes. You looked so pretty. Put your arms around me, little brother, hug me, sit close beside me, comfort me. Perhaps, I thought, if the Storm Trooper will see him dressed so beautifully, he will relent and take him as Pharaoh's daughter took Moses. Dearest little brother mine, forgive me. I meant to save you. I was duped. My darling—they wanted you, not for vaccination, but. . . . Forgive me, little one, forgive me, dear heart.

Please, do not worry about my crying. I do not cry. I laugh. See, I laugh. I have told you—I am Chayah and I shall live.

Perhaps I look too merry to you. Perhaps my eyes are not hard enough, my mouth not sad enough? Are you wondering how I survived? Let me show you,

friend. Do not turn away, you shall see; you must know. You see this new skin; it looks like a mere patch. Here, where this patch of new skin lies was once written "officers' whore." And now you know what my flesh hides, what my skin covers. Now you know—how I survived. In your hospital they grafted new skin. But the words are there nevertheless, and I see them and you shall see them too.

I see them. I see words written in blood; and I see numbers stencilled on wasted arms; I see trains heaped high with corpses; I see lines of humans driven into gas chambers; I see friends and relatives murdered, gassed, electrocuted. How did I stand it? I don't know. I don't know. But I am Chayah and I shall live.

I remember so many things that I want to forget. And I tell you, I shall forget them. For already there are events that crowd them out, events whose will to be remembered is strong and powerful.

Shall I tell you about the boat that brought me here? Or shall I go back further to the days when the first rays of light penetrated into the darkness and despair of our wretched existence. At first it was just a whisper. . . . A meaningful glance. . . . A tingling touch of the hand . . . an uncompleted phrase. . . . At last, liberation was come. An exodus greater than any exodus in world history. An exodus out of the DP camps, out of the degradation and hopelessness, an exodus out of the despair of being the driven, the shuttled, the harried and hunted, the unwanted. From Zion came our emancipation; from Zion our deliverance. Young men with golden skins and healthy minds moved amongst our dried, withered bones, caressing us with their faith and courage and love. *"Shelihim"* they called themselves; "messengers" from the Holy Land; *"malakhim"* we called them; "angels" from God. And they came, and they breathed life into our lungs . . . life . . . life.

We stole into boats, into tubs of boats. I can feel it all now. The foul stench of its bilge infiltrating the very air, the filthy latrines, the huddled, herded fear-ridden bodies who even now cringed and dared not stand straight in the light of the day. We took turns sleeping on the miserable pallets, the sacks filled with straw—there were not even enough of those to go around.

But we sailed. In the darkness of the night we sailed. Stealthily, lifting our anchors like the commonest of thieves—in the darkness of the night, we sailed. "Illegal," the world calls us . . . "anonymous" . . . "without identity." Yes, we were "illegal;" we were "anonymous shadows." We were "without identity," but we were free. Yes, we were free and the memories of our dead were free with us.

We sailed on the compassionate sea—for we were not torpedoed; and we were not intercepted. We sailed and we were free.

Look, look, it's here. We're here. It's our land. It's ours. look at it, Moishele. Here you, old man, let me help you; feast your eyes. We're free. We're here. This is ours, and we are free.

The rowboats came out to meet us. And look, there are those on shore for whom the oars do not go fast enough. They jump into the water—they swim to us. "Let us carry you" they shout; "Do not wait for the boats. Let us carry you on our backs into *our* land!"

Dear God, dear God, we are no longer cowed or beaten. Our heads are high. Proudly we sing the *Hatikvah.*

For I told you. This is my new land. Chayah is my new name. Chayah is life, and I—I shall live!

Book Notes

JEWISH HISTORY MADE EXCITING

A HISTORY OF THE JEWS, by Solomon Grayzel. Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1947. With Index and Bibliography. 835 pp. $3.50.

THE growing Jewish textbook literature has been greatly enriched by the appearance of Dr. Solomon Grayzel's volume, *A History of the Jews*. The book contains the benefits of accumulated knowledge of a seasoned scholar, reflects the point of view of a modern man and ardent Jew, and shows the skill of the experienced teacher and writer. Unlike the many conventional Jewish history textbooks which give the painful feeling of someone trying to wish upon the reader endless details about a world utterly removed from our own times and from the Jew as he is known today, Grayzel plunges the reader from the very beginning into the exciting story of a people and civilization that have played a major role in human destiny. One senses the drama and adventure of Jewish history practically throughout the 805 pages of the book. This is not surprising, for the author disclaims any pretense at aloofness or shallow objectivity and professes, "I believe in Judaism, and I have faith in the Jewish people. One of my reasons for writing *A History of the Jews* has been my desire to fortify the spirit and strengthen the determination of my fellow Jews to persevere in the path of our ancestors, and patiently and hopefully to labor for the welfare of mankind." It is this outright purposefulness that gives the book the ingredients of vitality, eventfulness and contemporaneousness.

The volume starts with the Second Commonwealth, for according to the author, there is greater need for better knowledge and finer understanding of the history of the *Jews* than of that of the ancient Hebrews. This is followed by sections—or, as Grayzel calls them, "books"—on the "Supremacy of the East," dealing with the Babylonian period; the "Jews in the West," the middle ages in Europe; "Retreat and Progress," the rise of Eastern European Jewry; and "Search for a Friendly Home," the era of emancipation up to 1947.

In a volume such as this, it would be only natural for students of Jewish history to differ with the author in regard to the selection of certain events, movements and personalities and their relative value in the vast and variegated canvass of some twenty-five hundred years of Jewish history. To use but one illustration, our author deems it necessary to devote some space in his chapter on the Golden Age in Spain to its major poets and to include quotations from Solomon ibn Gabirol, Moses ibn Ezra and Yehuda Halevi, but has less than one line for Chaim Nachman Bialik, with no reference whatever to his contribution to the Hebrew Renaissance. Indeed, Bialik does not even rate a picture in this richly and tastily illustrated volume. Does Dr. Grayzel really believe that the Jewish renaissance of the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century is less "golden" than that in Spain just because it took place about a millenium later?

One may also question the validity of the author's explanation for excluding the Biblical period in a volume which he calls "A History of the Jews," because it is more or less known. The fact that there is familiarity with Biblical lore is no assurance that there is understanding of the

role of the Hebrews—the Jews in this decisive period of growth and development of the genius of Judaism. On the contrary, the comparatively widespread knowledge of the Biblical period, because it is shared by the Western world, is altogether too much colored by Christological interpretation and bias and therefore is in great need of presentation by a Jewish scholar and teacher like Grayzel. A writer of textbooks today has the great advantage of recent studies and research in the field of Biblical history which could throw new light on the contribution of the Jew to religious thought and experience. The volumes *Toledot Ha-Emunah Hayisraelit* by Yehezkel Kaufman and "The Hebrews" by William A. Irwin in *The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man,* to mention but single examples of recent writings in Hebrew and in English on the subject, would in themselves add much to a deeper knowledge and finer appreciation of the place of Jewry and Judaism in the history of religion than one can derive from textbooks, Jewish and non-Jewish, colored by the era of "Higher anti-Semitic" criticism.

These and other observations are not intended to detract in the least from the significant contribution made by Dr. Grayzel. What Salo Baron has done with his *Social and Religious History of the Jews* for the teacher, Grayzel has accomplished for the student of Jewish history. Both have brought to Jewish historiography the socio-cultural rather than the chronico-lachrymose interpretation of Jewish history. It is this new approach which I feel will go a long way toward dispelling the prevailing ignorance of Jewish history which has prompted the author to undertake his difficult and challeging task.

SAMUEL M. BLUMENFIELD

BOOKS RECEIVED

SCIENCE AND JUDAISM, by Rabbi Harold Leiman and Rabbi Joseph Elias. Contains seven essays on aspects of the relation of scientific to religious thought from standpoint of Orthodox Judaism. One of the Jewish Pocket Books of the Education Department of Agudath Israel Youth Council of America. 70 pp. The Spero Foundation, New York, 1947. $.25.

WELLSPRINGS OF THE AMERICAN SPIRIT, edited by F. Ernest Johnson. Contains fourteen addresses delivered before the Institute for Religious and Social Studies by scholars who interpret various aspects of the American tradition. With Index. ix + 241 pp. Published by the Institute for Religious and Social Studies and distributed by Harper and Brothers, New York and London. 1948. $2.50.

JEWISH WELFARE AND THE WELFARE FUNDS

(*Continued from Page* 16)

structive.

If only the basic point of this presentation will be granted, then these pages have not been wasted. If the basic point is granted, then let others try to improve on the suggested alternative which I offer. And even if they refuse the suggested plan, let them not deny that the basic moral problem exists. If anyone can solve our dilemma by means of a better plan, that is all to the good.

And, for that matter, the basic evil of closed-chamber allocations exists even within the framework of the United Jewish Appeal itself.

Who is it that actually determines how U.J.A. monies are to be divided among the United Palestine Appeal, the Joint Distribution Committee and the United Service for New Americans? Have we forgotten the disagreement on this point that came to the fore a few years ago and that will no doubt occur again—come the recession? But, then, that is another color of the same horse, and we have enough to ride as it is.

Random Thoughts

It is true that men worshiped God before they knew anything about religion, just as they sowed and reaped before they knew anything about the chemistry of the soil.

We have come to realize, however, that agriculture can be vastly improved through the study of soil chemistry.

The worship of God, too, would be more intelligent and fruitful, if we knew something about the nature of religion.

* * *

Destiny is all too often used as an alibi for drift.

* * *

People who always find in the past what they miss in the present are generally unable to manage the future.

* * *

It is not true that Einstein was the first to arrive at the formula that led to the making of the atomic bomb.

The formula he arrived at led to the discovery of nuclear energy and the untold benefits it might bring to humanity.

The one to arrive at the formula that led to the making of the atomic bomb was Cain.

His formula took the form of a question. He asked: "Am I my brother's keeper?"

* * *

Intellectuals are no less eager to be stroked than ordinary men.

That is why they, too, arch and purr and rub against the knees of their bosses.

* * *

If religious leaders would be as unashamed to confess ignorance as scientific leaders, religion would enjoy as much prestige as science.

* * *

The teacher learned that one of her pupils turned out to be a minister, another a thief, and a third a murderess. She asked herself what she might have taught them that had anything to do with what they came to be.

All she could recall was that she had taught them the parsing of verbs and the rhyme scheme of sonnets.

* * *

If we succeeded in canceling out the tumult of the outside world and wrapped ourselves in the silence of our own solitariness, we would hear faintly something that is like a far away hum.

What might that sound be?

Some would say it was caused by the molecules hitting the eardrum.

Others would think it was due to the coursing of the blood stream.

To a few it would be something like "the sound of the thin stillness" during which Elijah heard the voice of God.

* * *

The late Yosef Hayyim Brenner is said to have complained that the Jews are "a people that forgets pogroms."

No wonder then that we had to be commanded twice in the Torah to remember Amalek.

Even that did not help. Because Saul had a hard time remembering Amalek, he lost his throne and his life.

Our better instinct tells us that a people should forget pogroms. Nothing good can come from remembering them.

* * *

To be subject to a common lot is not the same as having a common destiny.

* * *

It is much easier to unravel a tradition than to knit one.

* * *

Jews who, knowing nothing about

Judaism, want to be convinced of its worth and greatness, are as reasonable as people who refuse to go into the water before they have learned to swim.

* * *

One cannot be a Jew without actively belonging to the Jewish people, even as one cannot be a soldier without actively belonging to an army.

M. M. K.

Correspondence

Slum Conditions in Jerusalem

Sirs:

With reference to your comment in the February 20th issue of *The Reconstructionist* on the reasons why so many of the young Orthodox Jews are in the dissident groups in Jerusalem, may I point out that the lack of rapport with the Central European and so-called modern elements of the Jewish population is a relatively minor factor. The real reasons are to be found in the deplorable slum life in which about 60 percent of the Jewish population, and a far larger percentage of the youth of Jerusalem, live. Lack of opportunity for ordinary elementary education or the learning of a useful trade, child labor, crowded living, featured by one room "apartments" for families that run as high as 10 and 12 and more members, lack of sanitation, of facilities for recreation and social life—these are the conditions that breed rebellion among the youth. Of course, they will respond to the thrill and adventure offered by the Irgun and Sternists. In these groups, they feel that they count for something and they find compensation for the primitive existence to which they seem doomed in the *shekhunot* of Jerusalem. But, it must also be pointed out that they are found in far larger numbers among the disciplined ranks of Haganah, Palmach and the Commando units.

The Jews in the oriental quarters and the other poor sections are a majority now. They will continue to have large families. Their children remain in Jerusalem. The residents of the suburbs and better residential areas have few children. From the point of view of Jewish Jerusalem, therefore, the wholesome development of Jewish life for the inhabitants of its depressed areas is a problem of immediate concern and of the highest importance to the Yishuv. If, as the Jewish Agency has stated, the seat of government of Palestine may be Tel Aviv, but the "capitol" will always be Jerusalem, there remains much to be done to raise the level of ordinary living of a major part of the Jewish population and to create representative institutions, so that Jewish Jerusalem may truly symbolize the spiritual leadership which is associated with its time-honored place in Jewish history.

LOUIS KRAFT

Claims "New Life" Is Communist

Sirs:

Small wonder that innocent well-meaning Jews are easily taken in by the "comrades" in their myriad disguises, when the editors of THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST, steeped in Jewish and world lore, can be hoodwinked into well-wishing a new publication calculated to confuse our people.

The very fact that the "New Life" is a sort of *mamzer* (since its parentage is concealed it must be regarded as such) should have aroused your suspicions. No names of editors, no word as to auspices under which it is published is given, in the "preview issue." Only people who have something to conceal act that way.

Careful perusal of the publication should have indicated to any intelligent person the true intent of the publication. Does THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST (and its editors) believe that Czechoslovakia was "liberated" lately? If not, why have they not noticed the interview with Arnost Fischer in which the reference to "liberation" is made?

Since when do religious Jewish groups regard the late Solomon Mikhoels as a great Jew? Did any one deride Judaism any more than he did, extolling Stalinism at its expense? In fact, in practically every article in the publication, the Stalinist ideology sticks out like a sore thumb, yet the editors of THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST failed to notice it

Why should non-Jews not be confused about this business of Jews welcoming all sorts of communist fronts? THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST, and its editors, owe an explanation and apology to its readers. I happen to be one of the admirers of the Reconstructionist movement and I was shocked by the editorial endorsement of a publication calculated to confuse and harm our people.

OSCAR LEONARD

It may be that our naivete has mislead us. We have the habit recommended by our Sages, of judging men and institutions *lekhaf zekhut* (weighting the balance in their favor). We were impressed by the simultaneous publication of the magazine in London and Canada and the fact that its interests did not seem localized, for we like to stress the bond of unity among Jews in all parts of the world, and a hasty glance at the magazine seemed to indicate that it had such a purpose. At any rate, we need scarcely assure our readers of what is evident from the whole trend of our editorial comment, that we oppose communism and all other totalitarian ideologies.

EDITORS